

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 12-15 are pending the application; Claims 10, 11, and 16 are withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claim 1 has been objected to on the basis of informalities. Claims 1-9 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §112. Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC §101. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Lanigan [US 2003/0061085]. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Quackenbush et al [US Pat. No. 6,512,964] in view of Cash et al [US 2002/0134836] and Clark [US 2005/0209950]. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Quackenbush in view of Cash, Clark and Leonard et al [US 2002/0046109]. Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Quackenbush in view of Cash and Clark. By this Amendment, Claims 1-16 have been cancelled, and new Claims 17-23 have been added. These new claims add no new matter to the application.

In order to clarify the subject matter which is to be claimed, and to expedite an early arrival at an indication of allowable subject matter, Claims 1-9 and 12-15 have been cancelled without prejudice and replaced by new claims 17-23. In cancelling Claims 1-9 and 12-15, Applicant believes the objections to Claim 1 on the basis of informalities, the rejection of Claims 1-9 and 12-15 under 35 USC 112 and the rejection of Claims 2 and 3 under 35 USC 101 are now moot. Applicant respectfully traverses all these objections and rejections. New claims 17-23 have been drafted with due regard for the requirements of sections 101 and 112, and Applicant urges entry of, and early favorable action on, all these new claims. All new claims are drawn to the same elected species as already indicated in this case.

In addressing the cited art, Applicant notes that the filing date of US Patent Application Publication 2002/0134836 to Cash et al is March 25, 2002. Since Applicant's filing date is January 23, 2002, Applicant does not believe the reference is properly citable and respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw it as a basis for rejection.

In addition, Applicant believes new Claims 17-23 are more particularly directed to the subject matter; Applicant has diligently studied the cited art and believes that the claims as newly presented distinguish over the cited art.

For example, Independent Claims 17 and 20 both disclose a luggage transport client application installed and running on each service partner associated computer, which is a substantially distinguishing element, among others, over the cited art. This component, which enables seamless data transfer and communication as described in the specification, is not taught in the cited art. In fact, the method for business to business collaboration taught in Clark actually teaches away from changing the "trading partners" business systems in any way. "One trading partner may require that communications it receives use its preferred protocol as designated in its profile. In the event this is not possible, the trading partner server can act as a translator between the two trading partners." [Clark, Paragraph 0010]

In addition, no mention is made in any of the cited art of a luggage transport server application configured to handle the receipt, storage and matching of data specific to multiple travel segments for a single luggage transaction. As described in the specification, this now allows luggage journeys to be divided among multiple luggage handling service partners, an element not taught in the cited art.

The combination of multiple travel segments with another missing element from the cited art, that of multiple partners being solicited for a single travel segment, allows for the luggage transport server application to process bidding between service partners for each travel segment. This is another distinguishing element of the disclosed luggage transport server application.

Applicant believes that the aforementioned elements among others, which are not present in the cited art, serve to distinguish over the cited art and respectfully traverses the 35 USC §102(e) and 35 USC §103(a) rejections. Applicant urges early favorable action on new Claims 17-23.

Applicant believes that it has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed by the Examiner in the Office Action, and respectfully requests that new Claims be entered and examined, and that early favorable action be taken on all claims pending in the application. If the Examiner has any further concerns, Applicant requests a call to Applicant's attorney Patrick Dwyer at (206) 550-4049.

Respectfully submitted,



PATRICK MICHAEL DWYER
Reg. No. 32,411

P005D1-OA1.RSP

PATRICK M. DWYER PC
1818 WESTLAKE AVENUE N, SUITE 114
SEATTLE, WA 98109